



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,903	07/13/2006	Yoshiyuki Tani	10873.1926USWO	4063
53148 7590 03/28/2011 HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON P.C. P.O. BOX 2902 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902				
EXAMINER				
OSILE, MARK A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1745				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/28/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/585,903

Applicant(s)

TANI ET AL.

Examiner

Mark A. Osele

Art Unit

1745

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Japanese Patent Publication 9-197394 (Akira et al.) in view of Frederick (U.S. Patent 4,373,611), Mizutani et al. (U.S. Patent 6,258,666), and Mizuno et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,466,325). Akira et al. shows a method for peeling a film (element 1) from a display panel (element 2) the method making use of a film peeling device that comprises: a transport pallet, not shown, used to transport the display panel perpendicularly past a roller (paragraph 0016); and a cylindrical roller (element 4) disposed above the transport system where the effective length of the roller is longer than the length of the short side of the display panel wherein (See Fig. 1), and the method comprising: peeling off an end of a film that has been stuck on a display panel; fixing the peeled end of the film to the roller that is adjacent to or in contact with a panel face of the display panel; and peeling off the film from the display panel by rotationally driving the roller (English Abstract and partial translation). Akira et al. fails to show an internal motor for the roller.

Frederick teaches that a roller can be driven by either an internal or external motor (column 1, lines 23-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to replace the external motor of Akira et al. with an internal motor because Frederick teaches the two to be functionally equivalent alternate expedients. The references as combined fail to show the contact plate.

Mizutani et al. shows a peeling roller for removing a film from an electronic substrate wherein a roller, 5, and a contact plate, 6, are pressed by a mechanism to sandwich the film, 4, therebetween (See Figs. 1, 10b, 10c; column 3, lines 26-35; column 4, lines 15-22; column 5, lines 14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the adhesive patches of Akira et al. with the contact plate of Mizutani et al. because Mizutani et al. shows the contact plate to be a functionally equivalent alternate expedient to the adhesive patches with the advantage that the film will not be contaminated with adhesive (column 3, lines 36-39). The references as combined fail to show rotating the roller and at the same time moving the transport pallet.

Mizuno et al. shows a method of peeling a film from a panel on a transport pallet wherein both the take-up roller is rotated and the transport pallet is conveyed at the same time so as to peel off the film on the surface of the panel (See Fig. 1; column 3, lines 32-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to move the transport pallet simultaneously with rotating the roller because Mizuno et al. teaches that moving both simultaneously allows for a continuous process for removing films from a procession of panels.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Osele whose telephone number is 571-272-1235. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip Tucker can be reached on 571-272-1095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark A Osele/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1745
March 25, 2011